## REMARKS

## Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-20 remain pending of which claim 1 has been amended, and claims 18-20 have been newly added to more explicitly describe the claimed invention. The subject matter of the newly added claims is fully supported at paragraph [0012]. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter adds by way of addition of new claims or otherwise to the application.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 are in proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

## Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103

1. The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admission (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Ikeda et al. (US-5,121,237, hereinafter Ikeda).

In rejecting the above claims, the Examiner stated that AAPA discloses every features of the claimed invention except for the light shielding layer. However, the Examiner relied upon I keda to disclose the light shielding layer that shields the picture elements from light. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the AAPA display device to include Ikeda's light shielding layer to shield the picture elements from light.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections as set forth below. Independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable over AAPA and Ikeda for at least

the reason because AAPA and Ikeda substantially fail to teach, suggest or disclose every features of the claimed invention. More specifically, AAPA and Ikeda substantially fail to teach, suggest or disclose a liquid crystal display device comprising at least [a first substrate, having a first surface and a second surface; a liquid crystal layer, disposed among the second surface of the first substrate, the third surface of the second substrate and the sealant; and a light-shielding layer, disposed over the first surface of the first substrate and not overlapping a display area] as required by the amended proposed independent claim 1. The advantage of the above features is that at least leakage of light via the edge of bezel can be effectively reduced and also the misalignment the light shielding layer relative to the display area may be effectively avoided.

Instead, Ikeda, at col. 1, lines 29-54, substantially teaches that the published Unexamined Japanese Patent Application (PUPA) No. 62-145218 describes a display device including a light shield on the first glass substrate. The PUPA 62-145218 reference, in FIG, 1, substantially discloses a structure of a LCD comprising a first substrate (11) and a second substrate (12). The space between the first and second substrates (11, 12) is filled with liquid crystals materials (14). Furthermore, a light shielding layer (19), picture element electrodes (18, 20) and thin-film transistors (17) are also disposed between the first and second substrates. In other words, both the light shielding layer (19) and the liquid crystal materials (14) are disposed over the same surface of the first substrate (11) (and also over the same surface of the second substrate). Therefore, it is clearly evident that JP62-145218 substantially fails to teach, suggest or hint that the light-shielding layer (19) is disposed over the FIRST SURFACE of the first

substrate and the liquid crystal materials (14) is disposed over the SECOND SURFACE of the first substrate as required by the proposed independent claim 1, and therefore JP62-145218 cannot meet the claimed invention in this regard.

Furthermore, Ikeda, at FIG. 1, col. 4, lines 10-29, also substantially teaches both the light shielding layer (10) and liquid crystal materials (14) are disposed between the first and second substrates (2 and 4). Thus, both Ikeda and JP62-145218 substantially fail to teach, suggest or hint a liquid crystal display device comprising at least [a first substrate, having a first surface and a second surface: a liquid crystal layer, disposed among the second surface of the first substrate, the third surface of the second substrate and the sealant; and a light-shielding layer, disposed over the first surface of the first substrate and not overlapping a display areal as required by the proposed independent claim 1, instead Ikeda and JP62-145218 substantially teach both the light shielding layer (10, 19) and the liquid crystal materials (14) are disposed over the same surface of the first substrate (and also over the same surface of the second substrate). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that combination of AAPA and Ikeda (and JP62-145218), in a manner suggested by the Examiner, can not possibly meet the claimed invention in this regard

Because the proposed independent claim 9, which is directed to a method of fabricating a liquid crystal device, also recites features that are similar to the proposed independent claim 1, therefore Applicants similarly submit that claim 9 also patently defines over AAPA and Ikeda (and JP62-145218) for at least the same reasons discussed above, and should be allowed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the newly added proposed independent claim 18, which is directed to a method of fabricating a liquid crystal device, recites the steps of <u>lexposing the sealant to a light for curing the sealant so that the liquid crystal layer is sealed between the first substrate and the second substrate; and after sealing the liquid crystal layer between the first and second substrates, forming a light-shielding layer over a surface of either the first substrate or a surface of the second substrate].</u>

Applicants respectfully submit that because both Ikeda and JP62-145218 substantially teach both the light shielding layer (10, 19) and the liquid crystal materials (14) are disposed over the same surface of the first substrate (and also over the same surface of the second substrate). Therefore, it is clear that the light shielding layer (10, 19) is formed on the surface of the first substrate (or the second substrate) BEFORE curing the sealant for sealing the liquid crystal materials (14) between the first and second substrates. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the newly added proposed independent claim 18 also patently define over AAPA, Ikeda and JP62-145218, and should be allowed.

Claims 2-6, 10-17 and 19-20, which directly or indirectly depend from the independent Claims 1, 9 and 18 are also patentable over AAPA and Ikeda at least because of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 and 9-17 patently define over AAPA and Ikeda. Reconsideration and withdrawal of above rejections is respectfully requested.

2. The Office Action rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admission (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Ikeda, and further in view of Yoshimura et al. (US-6,618,112, hereinafter Yoshimura).

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Yoshimura cannot cure the specific deficiencies of AAPA and Ikeda for at least the reasons substantially discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons discussed above, claims 7-8 patently define over AAPA, Ikeda and Yoshimura. Reconsideration and withdrawal of above rejections is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-20 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date: MW. 4,2505

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office 7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800 Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw;usa@jcipgroup.com.tw